



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,492	03/08/2001	Michael E. Baskey	POU920010012US1	4752

7590 08/04/2004

Floyd A. Gonzalez - Attorney  
IBM Corporation - MS P386  
2455 South Road  
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

EXAMINER

WU, ALLEN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/801,492

Applicant(s)

BASKEY ET AL.

Examiner

Allen S. Wu

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 March 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Claims 5, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claims 5, 12, and 18 recites the limitation "the proxy client" in lines 2, 3, and 4 of respective claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Drawings***

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference character(s) mentioned in the description: 101B, 102B, 102A, 101A (page 15 line 20-31); 200, 201A1 (page 17 line 5); 300 (page 19 line 5). Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 200A2, 200A1 (fig 2); 301, 301A, 301B1, 301B2, 301B3, 302, 302B1, 302A2, 302B2, 303, 303A1, 303A2, 303A3, 303B1, 304 (fig 3); 400AB, 400AB2, 401A, 401B1, 401B2, 303, 409 (fig 4); 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 707, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719 (fig 7); 802, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 814, 815, 816, 817 (fig 8); 1502, 1504, 1505, 1506, 1507, 1508, 1509, 1510, 1513, 1511, 1513, 1516, 1517 (fig 15); 1602, 1604, 1613, 1617 (fig 16) Corrected drawing sheets, or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kung, US Patent 5,241,594, in view of Drogichen et al (hereinafter Drogichen), US Patent 5,931,938.

As per claims 1, 8, 14, and 20, Kung discloses providing security in a processing system (abstract) comprising:

- a) sending a request for authorization by a user to the security client (see for example; col 4 ln 60-63 and col 5 ln 60-62);
- b) transmitting the request for authorization from the security client to the common security server (see for example; col 5 ln 1-5 and col 5 ln 62-65); and,
- d) transmitting a second response from the security client to the user (see for example; col 5 ln 5-17 and col 6 ln 45-50).

Kung further discloses that such security client (multiple logon procedure, col 4 ln 55-60) can be operated on in different computing systems (workstation, 16 of fig 1, remote host, col 5 ln 60-62, or server, col 6 ln 51-59) and thus independent of systems. Kung also discloses a common security server (authorization routine, col 4 ln 64-67 and col 5 ln 62-65). Kung is silent on the details of the processing system being a partitioned processing system having a first partition which includes a common security server and a second partition which includes a security client and for transmitting a first response the request for authorization from the common security server in the first partition to the security client in the second partition said transmission of one of said request or said first response between partitions being by way of main storage. Drogichen

further discloses a partitioned processing system consisting of independent systems (see for example; col 1 ln 45-62, col 2 ln 33-35) and communication between the partitions by way main storage (see for example; col 1 ln 50-55 and col 3 ln 45-50). Both Kung and Drogichen disclose a processing system of which operate independent processes over a distributed computing system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to further incorporate the partitioning of a processing system of Drogichen within the system of Kung because it would have provided a means of processing secure user authorization by a stable means wherein errors caused by one process does not effect other processes (see Drogichen, col 1 ln 45-62).

As per claims 3, 10, 16, and 22, Kung-Drogichen discloses the claimed limitations as described above (see claim 1). As for one of step b or step c includes using main storage shared between the first partition and the second partition, Drogichen further discloses the use of main storage shared between the first partition and the second partition (see for example; col 1 ln 50-55 and col 3 ln 45-50).

As per claims 4, 11, 17, and 23, Kung-Drogichen discloses the claimed limitations as described above (see claim 1). As for one of step b or step c includes using main storage linked between the first partition and the second partition by a memory-to-memory data mover, Drogichen discloses such a

memory-to-memory data mover (see for example; col 6 ln 25-31 and col 7 ln 52-59).

As per claims 6, 13, 19, and 25, Kung-Drogichen discloses the claimed limitations as described above (see claim 1). As for transmitting the first response from the common security server to the security client by way of a first program running in the first partition, Kung further discloses a first program running in the security server (see for example; authorization routine, col 5 ln 60-64). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have realized such a first program to be part of the security client in the first partition I the Kung-Drogichen combination.

As per claim 7, Kung-Drogichen discloses the claimed limitations as described above (see claim 1). As for said second response transmitted from the security client in the second partition to the user is a program action, Kung further discloses logging into the computer based on a decision (see for example; col 5 ln 15-22 and col 6 ln 45-50) and thus a second response. Such response must be being done through a program (routine) operated by a computing device is inherently a program action.

As per claim 26, Kung-Drogichen discloses the claimed limitations as described above (see claim 1). As for a third partition having a second security

client, and said common security server of said first partition being responsive to requests for authorization from the security client of the second partition or the second security client of the third partition, Kung discloses a login procedure for each user (see for example; 16, fig 1 and col 4 ln 6-29). Kung is silent on the details of supporting multiple user authentication of the information processing system. Drogichen further discloses multiple partitions for running different processes (see for example; col 6 ln 13-24). One of ordinary skill in the art would have realized such use of a third partition for a second security client for authentication of a second user through repeating means disclosed above (see claim 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to repeat such means for a second security client in the Kung-Drogichen combination because it would have added the usability of authentication of multiple users, which is an important feature to distributed systems.

8. Claims 2, 5, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, and 24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kung, US Patent 5,241,594, in view of Drogichen et al (hereinafter Drogichen), US Patent 5,931,938.

As per claims 2, 9, 15, and 21, Kung-Drogichen discloses the claimed limitations as described above. Kung further discloses authentication of users for different applications (see for example; col 2 ln 11-24). However, Kung-



Drogichen is silent on each application having different security protocols. Hu discloses a means of securing an information processing system wherein

b1) signaling by the security client, a first program to start a proxy client (see for example; proxy server col 4 ln 5-16); and,

b2) transmitting the request from the proxy client to the security server (see for example; gateway system; fig 2, col 4 ln 12-22).

Both Kung-Drogichen and Hu disclose an information processing system running multiple processes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the proxy client of Hu within the Kung-Drogichen combination because it would have enhanced the authentication of clients to different security protocols, thus solving the growing evolution of security mechanisms in distributed systems.

As per claims 5, 12, 18, and 24, Kung-Drogichen discloses the claimed limitations as described above (see claim 1). As for a program call by the proxy client using an interface native to the security server, Kung further discloses authentication of users for different applications (see for example; col 2 ln 11-24). However, Kung-Drogichen is silent on each application having different security protocols. Hu discloses a means of securing an information processing system using such a proxy in aiding client authentication (see for example; col 2 ln 13-19 and col 4 ln 5-16). Both Kung-Drogichen and Hu disclose an information processing system running multiple processes. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the proxy client of Hu within the Kung-Drogichen combination because it would have enhanced the authentication of clients to different security protocols, thus solving the growing evolution of security mechanisms in distributed systems.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Olkin, US Patent 5,768,503, discloses user authentication using a processing system containing a security client and security server.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen S. Wu whose telephone number is 703-305-0708. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 703-305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2135

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Allen Wu  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2135

*Handwritten signature*  
AU 2135